

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 140 424

EA 009 580

TITLE Emergency Educational Assistance Act. Calendar No. 116. 95th Congress, 1st Session. Senate Report No. 95-141. Report to Accompany S. 701.

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Human Resources.

PUB DATE 12 May 77

NOTE 22p.; For a related document, see EA 009 579; Not available in hard copy due to small print size of most of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 Plus Postage. LC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS *Costs; *Educational Facilities; Educational Finance; Educational Legislation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Energy Conservation; *Federal Aid; Federal Government; *Federal Legislation; Fuel Consumption; *Heating; Post Secondary Education; Records (Forms)

IDENTIFIERS *Emergency Educational Assistance Act

ABSTRACT

This publication is a brief report that summarizes the deliberations and actions of the U.S. Senate Committee on Human Resources in considering S. 701, the Emergency Educational Assistance Act of 1977. Separate sections of the report discuss the background of S. 701 as amended by the committee, the purpose of S. 701, the committee's votes on S. 701 and its various amendments, estimated costs of implementing S. 701, the regulatory impact of S. 701, and a section-by-section analysis of S. 701. Also included are model application forms for grants under S. 701 and executive communications on S. 701 from the Office of Management and Budget and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. (JG)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED140424

Calendar No. 116

95TH CONGRESS }
1st Session }

SENATE

Report
No. 95-141

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EMERGENCY EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT

MAY 12 (legislative day, MAY 9), 1977.—Ordered to be printed under authority of the order of the Senate

Mr. PELL, from the Committee on Human Resources,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 701]

The Committee on Human Resources, to which was referred the bill (S. 701) to provide Federal financial assistance to educational institutions in order to assist such institutions to meet the emergency caused by the high costs of fuel and fuel shortages and harsh weather conditions, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

BACKGROUND OF THE COMMITTEE BILL

In 1974, during the 93d Congress, the Committee on Human Resources, then called the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, held a day of hearings on the effects of the energy crisis on education. Legislation was prepared at that time.

S. 701, following that concept, was introduced on February 10, 1977. The Committee on Human Resources held two days of hearings which examined and reviewed the impact of the energy crisis in our nation's schools.

Two days of hearings were held. On February 14, the committee heard from local and State officials on their perception of the energy crisis. On March 11, the committee heard from several major education associations on the impact of the energy crisis nationwide, as well as some measures that have been taken, and can be taken, to alleviate the problem.

Subcommittee deliberation covered 2 months. On April 19 the members met and reported the measure to full committee unanimously. The full committee met in executive session on two occasions during their deliberation. Those meetings were on May 5 and May 10, 1977.

EA 009 580

On May 19, the legislation was voted out of the full committee and ordered reported to the Senate.

BRIEF SUMMARY AND PURPOSE OF THE COMMITTEE BILL

S. 701 provides for three grant programs to benefit three separate types of institutions: (1) institutions of higher education; (2) public elementary and secondary schools, and (3) private, nonprofit elementary and secondary schools.

The first grant program is the basic grants authorized under the bill. These matching grants are meant to support work in renovation, insulation, equipment repair and updating, and minor reconstruction. The committee heard testimony that the average school in the United States could cut its energy use by 30 to 40 percent with an expenditure of \$150,000 in energy conservation measures. This would be a major refit. In many instances, a substantial energy saving can be made with much less expensive programs. The purpose of the committee in raising this point is to demonstrate that the projects envisioned pursuant to this act do not require major investments of Federal money, especially considering that the Federal Government will only be paying for half of the work done in such cases. The money authorized then, if fully appropriated, is enough to fund projects at a large number of institutions and make a sizable impact on the field. A second point the committee wishes to make is that the projects involved do not require the use of exotic technology. On the contrary, the intent of the committee is that projects carried out pursuant to the basic grant section will use proven processes and technology. This will greatly expedite and simplify the application and administrative process in regard to the work carried out pursuant to this act. That is also a major concern of the members.

The demonstration projects are intended to combine elements of the two other programs authorized by this bill. The committee is aware that many educational institutions have difficulty in handling the technical problems necessary to deal with energy use and conservation. Therefore, it is the intention of the members that these grants be used to sponsor projects which will help to solve the energy-use problems of a large number of institutions, or which could be easily duplicated by a large number of institutions without the need for the employment of highly specialized personnel. Two examples of the type of work envisioned by the committee are: (1) The formation of a task force at the State level which would work with educational institutions throughout the State to conserve energy use, and (2) the development of a renovation, insulation, or repair project by one institution that would then be fully outlined to other such institutions in order that they could perform the same work for themselves. Because this program covers an innovative use of resources, the committee expects that some innovative technology might be employed in some projects. However, the members stipulate that this project not be used to fund any academic research or any applications of esoteric skills. The overriding concern of the committee, with this project and with the two others provided for by the bill, is to help educational institutions apply programs which will save energy. That should also be the primary concern of those who apply for grants provided and for those who administer these programs.

The technical assistance program is designed to support those activities which can conserve energy but which do not involve reconstruction or equipment renovation. The members intend this program to be used to support projects in educational institutions which concentrate on the management of energy use. Such management could include: (1) Energy use surveys to determine use patterns and problem areas; (2) thermostat adjustments in buildings when those structures are not in use; (3) planning for more extensive energy conservation projects; and (4) the temporary employment of specialized personnel for the purposes of implementing or planning energy conservation projects. The members wish to stress that any personnel employed for any work carried on pursuant to the program authorized are strictly temporary in nature. It is not the intent of this legislation to subsidize existing physical plant staff or to eventually add individuals on to some public employment roll.

S. 701 deals with a very broad scale emergency and some appreciation of that scope is necessary to see the urgent need for this legislation. The following figures deal with the scope of the problem in elementary and secondary schools.

There are approximately 16,600 school districts in the United States. The average school district has over 80 percent of its budget committed to salaries for teachers, administrators, and service personnel. This leaves a balance of no more than 20 percent of the budget available for more or less discretionary items.

Traditionally, about 12.5 to 15 percent of the discretionary budget has been utilized to pay energy costs. With the energy upheaval brought about by escalating oil prices within the past 3 years, school districts now must commit 25 to 35 percent of their discretionary budget to cover energy costs for lighting, heating, air conditioning, and other essential energy consuming activities. Preliminary results of a Federal Energy Administration survey conducted in the spring 1976 show that through diligent efforts the schools have been able to reduce energy consumption over: 11 percent in New England while energy costs for the same period increased 67 percent. A review of the attached FEA report indicates that across the country school administrators have made an effort to cut consumption but have still found their energy costs escalating rapidly.

The FEA has also calculated that K-12 schools consume over 170 million barrels of oil per year. They suggest that if 30 percent of the 60,000 elementary and 26,000 secondary schools were retrofitted, the Nation would save 25 million barrels of oil per year or 68,000 barrels per day. The "paper figure" for schools needing major retrofitting is \$150,000 for an elementary school and \$200,000 for a high school. Obviously, this would vary with the size of the school, its structure, and the energy conserving opportunities that are identified. FEA has estimated the cost of doing 30 percent of the Nation's schools at \$4.5 billion—\$2.7 billion for elementary schools and \$1.8 billion for secondary schools.

To translate these statistics into a very hard picture it is necessary to realize that the Nation's public schools spent an estimated \$514 million more on fuel in 1974-75 than they did in 1972-73. At current salary rates, that represents about 43,000 teaching positions.

Here are some figures concerning the impact of the energy crisis on higher education.

Between the 1972-73 academic year (which is fiscal year 1973) and the 1974-75 academic year (fiscal year 1975), total energy costs at colleges and universities rose from \$555 million to \$945 million, a 70 percent increase.

Over the same period, total energy consumption decreased by 6 percent from 4.25 billion therms to 4.01 billion therms. (These figures make no adjustments for changes in student enrollment or in size of physical plant.)

Overall energy costs averaged 13.1 cents per therm in 1972-73 and 22.5 cents per therm in 1974-75, a 79-percent increase.

Institutions in the East and South experienced the greatest increases in total energy costs—94 percent and 84 percent, respectively. Smaller increases occurred in the Midwest (48 percent) and the West (40 percent).

Ignoring increased enrollment and plant size, overall declines in energy consumption were highest in the South (7 percent), followed by the West and the Midwest (6 percent each), and the East (3 percent). The per-unit cost of energy increased most at institutions in the East (101 percent), from 16 cents to 33 cents per therm. The South averaged a 97-percent increase (from 12 cents to 23 cents); the Midwest, 53 percent (from 12 cents to 20 cents); and the West, 50 percent (from 12 cents to 18 cents).

In 1974-75, the East paid the highest per-unit cost for all types of fuel except coal.

Over the 2-year period, the per-unit cost of both natural gas and coal rose most sharply in the South (100 percent and 185 percent, respectively).

Oil was the predominant source of energy in the East (providing nearly 50 percent of the total therms consumed, whereas natural gas was the predominant source in the West (providing about 65 percent of total therms consumed), in the South (over 50 percent), and in the Midwest (just under 50 percent).

Nonprofit institutions of higher education spend more than \$1.2 billion annually on energy, or an equivalent of 100 million barrels of fuel oil per year. In the national pursuit of the goal of energy independence, the consumption reduction potential of such a significant category of user cannot be overlooked.

Field experience within nonprofit institutions of higher education indicates that a properly phased program of investments of approximately \$2 per gross square feet can reduce energy consumption by at least 25 percent, with a potential reduction as high as 40 percent in some of the more sophisticated research institutions.

Due to the clear pattern of mutual cooperation and information sharing which has existed among educational institutions, funds spent for energy conservation would be uniquely amplified in a manner unavailable in the more competitive sectors of the energy consuming economy.

The total size of existing facilities at institutions of higher education amounts to approximately 1.9 billion square feet. To realize consumption reductions in the range of 25-40 percent funds of \$3.8 billion will be required based on a rehabilitation investment of \$2 per gross

square feet. Existing federal appropriation mechanisms provide several opportunities for this type of funding especially in the area of matching facilities grants.

Approximately 265,000 construction jobs would be created by the suggested \$3.8 billion building rehabilitation program, based upon AFL/CIO estimated 70,000 construction jobs per \$1 billion of construction expenditures; this economic stimulus to be achieved by an investment program which will reduce both energy consumption and the cost of education nationally.

In total, then, we are considering a total program that would cost \$8.3 billion. At a full level of funding, that would mean that this act would have to be continued for over 8 years. However, the immediate return on this investment would be enormous, as much as \$700 million to \$900 million a year in energy savings. Since the budgets of our Nation's educational institutions are almost entirely supported by local or State funds, this would represent a much needed relief for many of our hard-pressed communities.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1977.

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.,
*Chairman, Committee on Human Resources, U.S. Senate, Senate
Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request of February 15, 1977, for the views of the Office of Management and Budget on S. 701, a bill entitled the "Emergency Educational Assistance Act."

On April 20, 1977, the President presented to the Congress the outline of his national energy plan and the implementing legislation was transmitted to the Congress last week.

Part C of the President's National Energy Act would amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide Federal grants for assisting public and nonprofit schools and hospitals in installing conservation measures. The President's proposal calls for an appropriation authorization of \$300 million for the 3-year period, fiscal years 1978 through 1980, and these Federal funds would be available for meeting up to 40 percent of the cost of approved conservation projects. The program would be administered by the Federal Energy Administration.

In contrast, S. 701 would (1) provide assistance to schools only; (2) include conservation demonstration projects and technical assistance for conservation measures within the scope of the bill; (3) authorize appropriations of \$2 billion; (4) place the Federal cost share at 50 percent or 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent, depending on the type of conservation assistance; and (5) charge the Commissioner of Education with program administration.

In terms of program scope, appropriate funding level, cost sharing, and program administration, we strongly believe that the President's proposal provides a reasoned and effective approach to achieving en-

ergy conservation in schools and hospitals. Moreover, it is designed as an integral element in the President's comprehensive energy plan.

Accordingly, the Office of Management and Budget strongly recommends enactment of the President's proposed National Energy Act in lieu of S. 701. Enactment of S. 701 would not be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. FREY,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,

May 5, 1977.

HON. HARRISON. A. WILLIAMS, JR.,
Chairman, Committee on Human Resources, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for a report on S. 701, a bill "To provide financial assistance to educational institutions in order to assist such institutions to meet the emergency caused by the high costs of fuel and fuel shortages and harsh weather conditions, and for other purposes."

We support the basic goal of S. 701; however the administration has offered, as part of the President's National Energy Act, an amendment to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act which would accomplish essentially the same purposes with a broader approach, dealing with both school and hospital facilities, integrated into the overall energy policy of the United States. We believe the comprehensive approach in the administration's proposal is preferable to that embodied in S. 701.

S. 701 would authorize a program of basic grants to educational institutions for the purpose of paying a portion of the cost of energy conservation measures. The basic grant program would be administered by the Commissioner of Education and authorized at a level of \$300 million for each fiscal year prior to October 1981. Of this amount, 80 percent would be allocated among the States on the basis of population, and 20 percent would be allocated at the Commissioner's discretion. The grants would pay up to 50 percent of the cost of approved projects. Applications would go to State education agencies or State energy agencies for comment before being forwarded to the Commissioner.

S. 701 would authorize two further programs not contained in the administration proposal. The first of these would authorize grants to State and local education agencies, State energy offices, and institutions of higher education for energy conservation demonstration projects. The bill would authorize \$50 million for this purpose for fiscal year 1978 and for each succeeding fiscal year prior to October 1, 1981. The Federal share of costs of such projects would be 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent.

The second additional program which would be authorized by S. 701 is for grants to State and local education agencies, State energy offices, and institutions of higher education to provide technical assistance for energy conservation measures. The bill would authorize \$150 million for this purpose for fiscal year 1978 and for each succeeding fiscal year prior to October 1, 1981. The Federal share of the costs of such proj-

ects would be 50 percent, except in cases of extreme need where the Commissioner may waive the matching requirement.

The administration bill would authorize the same \$300 million funding through September 30, 1980, as would be provided under the basic grant portion of S. 701. The Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration would make grants to the States to fund 40 percent of the cost of approved projects undertaken by schools and hospitals. Ninety percent of the amount appropriated would be distributed among the States in accordance with a formula determined by the Administrator taking into account such factors as population and climate. Ten percent would be distributed among the States at the discretion of the Administrator, taking into account the cost of energy and such other factors as the Administrator deems relevant. The Administrator would require States to develop plans for installation of energy conservation measures in schools and hospitals; such plans would, among other purposes, establish procedures to ensure that equitable consideration is given to all eligible public and nonprofit institutions.

S. 701 attempts to achieve an important purpose; however, at a time when there is a major national effort under way to create a comprehensive Federal energy policy, it would be inappropriate to initiate a program which would deal only with the schools and would exist outside the framework of that policy. We believe that the Administration's proposed new program under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act is preferable to S. 701 and would accomplish the same major purpose. The administration program is broader in scope in that it includes higher education facilities and hospitals, is administered by an energy agency that can help States determine the most cost effective and fuel efficient measures, and has a more realistic funding level. The administration's bill would not needlessly duplicate the energy conservation demonstration projects now funded by the Energy Research and Development Administration. Furthermore, the administration bill would target monies more directly to areas of need through a formula that would take into account climate and other relevant factors.

Therefore, while we support the intent of S. 701, we believe the administration's approach is a more appropriate vehicle to accomplish the purposes of the bill.

We are advised by the Office of Management and Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report to the Congress, and that enactment of the administration's proposed National Energy Act would be in accord with the program of the President. Moreover, we are further advised by the Office of Management and Budget that enactment of S. 701 would not be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, Jr.,

Secretary.

II. VOTES IN COMMITTEE

Pursuant to section 133(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, the following is a tabulation of votes cast in committee.

No. 1: Motion by Mr. Pell to report S. 701, with amendment, to the full committee. Adopted 5 yeas, 0 nays.

YEAS

NAY

Mr. Randolph
Mr. Kennedy
Mr. Eagleton
Mr. Hayakawa
Mr. Pell

No. 2: Amendment by Mr. Eagleton, Mr. Pell, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Javits to include nonprofit elementary and secondary schools in the construction and demonstration programs authorized by the bill. Adopted by voice vote.

No. 3: Amendment by Mr. Javits to include a severability provision in the language of the bill. Adopted by voice vote.

No. 3: Amendment by Mr. Javits to include a severability provision in the language of the bill. Adopted by voice vote.

No. 4: Amendment by Mr. Stafford to include a provision that applications submitted to the Commissioner certify that the projects proposed will conserve energy. Adopted by voice vote.

No. 5: Motion by Mr. Pell to report S. 701, with amendments. Adopted by voice vote.

III. COST ESTIMATES ON S. 701. SUBMITTED TO THE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,

U.S. CONGRESS,

Washington, D.C., May 11, 1977.

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.,
Chairman, Committee on Human Resources,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Congressional Budget Office has prepared the attached cost estimate for S. 701, the Emergency Educational Assistance Act.

Should the committee so desire, we would be pleased to provide further details on the attached cost estimate.

Sincerely,

ALICE M. RIVLIN,
Director.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

COST ESTIMATE

1. Bill No. S. 701.
2. Bill title. Emergency Educational Assistance Act.
3. Purpose of bill. This bill provides federal assistance to financially needy educational institutions to assist them in meeting the emergency caused by high fuel costs, fuel shortages, and harsh weather conditions. The assistance is provided through (1) a basic state formula grant for building renovations designed to conserve energy, (2) energy conservation demonstration projects, (3) technical assistance supplied by universities to enable local school districts to operate their

buildings most efficiently. Actual funding is subject to subsequent appropriation action.

4. Cost estimate:

[In millions of dollars; fiscal years]

	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982
Authorization levels:					
Basic grants.....	300	300	300	300	300
Demonstration project.....	50	50	50	50	50
Technical assistance.....	150	150	150	150	150
Total.....	500	500	500	500	500
Projected total outlays:¹					
Basic grants.....	60	210	270	285	300
Demonstration project.....	23	46	50	50	50
Technical assistance.....	112	142	150	150	150
Total.....	195	398	470	485	500

¹ Outlays assume full program funding.

5. Basis for estimate. This estimate is based on the authorization levels stated in S. 701. The spending rates for the basic grants were assumed similar to other types of building renovation projects. The demonstration project and technical assistance spending patterns reflect those of other college short term research grant programs.

6. Estimate comparison. Not applicable.

7. Previous CBO estimate. None.

8. Estimate prepared by: Deborah Kalcevic (225-7766).

9. Estimate approved by:

JAMES L. BLUM,

Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

IV. REGULATORY IMPACT

In accordance with paragraph V of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following statement of the regulatory impact of the bill is made.

The basic purpose of the bill is to provide grants to schools, States, and institutions of higher education.

This bill does not require the regulation of any person, business, or institution. Schools, States, or institutions of higher education which want to apply for grants pursuant to the programs established by this bill, though, will have to complete applications which will require following a reasonable number of regulations. Thus, every school, State or institution of higher education may apply for these grants; and in doing so those schools, States, or institutions of higher education will have to comply with program regulations.

The regulations involved in this program are related to the receipt of Federal funds. Therefore the economic impact on many applicants will be compensated since the request for a project involves a self-analysis of energy use which can be incorporated into the project itself, once funding is granted. For those agencies and institutions which apply and are not funded, the self-analysis can still be put to use. There are many small and poor institutions and schools which will, even with the comparatively simple application form, have to

devote a significant amount of time and expertise in order to complete a request. It is hoped that State agencies will use Demonstration Project funds to establish statewide services designed specifically to help such poorer districts meet the energy crisis.

No personal information of any kind is required in the paperwork or regulatory provisions of this bill. Therefore, this bill has no impact on the personal privacy of any individuals involved with these projects.

Since the number of eligible schools, agencies and institutions of higher education is very large, being inclusive of virtually all such schools in the United States, the potential for paperwork is great. However, the paperwork required by the provisions of this act will be voluntary only. Those schools, agencies, and institutions which do not want to apply need not deal with any paperwork.

We estimate on the basis of the model forms (III-A, III-B) that most school districts could afford the costs and professional expertise demanded in dealing with application paperwork. The one program, demonstration projects, that involves heavy paperwork contains a higher ratio of funds, Federal to State, which will compensate applicants for the extra paperwork involved.

The committee strongly believes that the following model application forms and model criteria should be seriously considered upon implementation of the provisions of this bill. These models have been constructed in consultation with educators, administrators, and engineers working in, or familiar with, our Nation's educational system. They are not only comprehensive enough to allow evaluation, but they are also straightforward and comprehensible; ideal requirements for this type of form.

III—A: MODEL APPLICATION FORM FOR BASIC GRANTS (S. 701)

Proposed Grant Application Form (S701) - Basic Grants

APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE ENERGY CONSERVATION - BASIC GRANTS		Date Prepared	2. CODING
		3. CODING	
1. State Grantor Agency		4. Applicant	
administrative unit		school district, department, division	
street address		street address	
city	state zip code	city	county
		state	zip code

5. Demonstrated energy need. Reason: Relief is sought due to: (Explanation)
- a) high energy costs a) \$ / unit of fuel
- b) energy shortage b) documentation
reduced allocation
school closing due to energy shortage
- c) unusually harsh and persistent adverse weather conditions . . . c) Degree days
(July 1, 1976-June 30, 1977)
Other conditions (explain):

6. Name, address (grant building(s))

7. General description of proposed Energy Conserving Investments (in rank order):

Conservation Measures	Approximate Cost
a.	\$
b.	
c.	
d.	
e. Planning, engineering, legal fees	
f. Total (Sum lines a-e)	

FEDERAL REQUEST
Federal Share (50% of line f) \$

8. Types of fuel(s) saved: 10. Cost/BTU (July 1, 1976-June 30, 1977):
9. BTU saved/year (July 1, 1972-June 30, 1973):
11. Cost avoided/year: \$ (1976-77 price)
- 2nd fuel, if applicable
- Authenticated by
- Authorized by

12. Energy data

A.

FUEL USED July 1, 1972 - June 30, 1973

Type	KWH, Tons, Gal., CCF	Factor	BTU x 10 ³	%	Cost	Cost/ BTU
oil	_____ gals	138 #2 oil 145 #4 oil 148 #5 oil 150 #6 oil			/gal	
gas	_____ CCF	1			/CCF	
coal	_____ tons	25,400 anthracite 21,000 western 21,600 bituminous			/ton	
elec	_____ KWH	3.41			/KWH	
other						
TOTAL				100%		

B.

FUEL USED July 1, 1976 - June 30, 1977

Type	KWH, Tons, Gal., CCF	Factor	BTU x 10 ³	%	Cost	Cost/ BTU
oil	_____ gals	138 #2 oil 145 #4 oil 148 #5 oil 150 #6 oil			/gal	
gas	_____ CCF	1			/CCF	
coal	_____ tons	25,400 anthracite 21,000 western 21,600 bituminous			/ton	
elec	_____ KWH	3.41			/KWH	
other						
TOTAL				100%		

13. Sq. ft. of total building floor(s) _____
14. Degree days (July 1, 1976 - June 30, 1977) _____
15. BTU/sq. ft. (July 1, 1972 - June 30, 1973) _____ (grant building only)
- BTU/sq. ft. (July 1, 1976 - June 30, 1977) _____ (grant building only)

16. Aggregate calculated BTU/sq. ft./year to be saved by modifications (over July 1, 1976 - June 30, 1977 figure):

BTU/sq. ft./year

17. Amortization of investment cost:

a. Estimated cost of modifications \$

b. Calculated avoided cost

1976-77 price: $\frac{\text{BTU saved} \times \text{1976-77 cost/BTU}}{\text{2nd fuel, if applicable}}$ = \$

- c. Cost avoidance table

76-77 Base Cost avoided	YEAR	FACTOR 20% Increase Compounded Annually	Cost Avoided	Cumulative Total
(17b)	1977-78	1.20		
	1978-79	1.44		
	1979-80	1.69		
	1980-81	2.03		*

*If last cumulative total above does not exceed or equal the investment cost of the modifications, show number of years required for amortization of the investment (attach calculations) _____ years.

18. Matching funds

Local Share (50% of estimated energy conserving measures, line 7)

\$

Proposed method of financing local share

Source(s) of funding	Amount
1.	\$
2.	\$
3.	\$
4.	\$
TOTAL	\$

Pending matching funds: (explain)

\$

19. General description of the project.
Describe each energy conserving measure to be taken on a form identical to attached "Form B." Also include or attach calculations supporting quantitative information on Form B.
20. Identify authenticating authority and attach qualifications information: _____

21. Describe method of evaluating the effectiveness of the modification: _____

22. Are state approval procedures required for proposed energy conservation measures?
yes no If yes, indicate status of approval: _____

23. The applicant certifies that to the best of his/her knowledge and belief, the data in this application are true and correct, and that he/she will comply with the attached assurances if the grant is awarded.

signature _____

name (print) _____

organization's name _____

city _____

/ _____
phone number

Application form will also require:

Completed assurances, e.g. all legal requirements; sharing information with private schools

Instructions, including a completed sample form

APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Energy Conservation -- Basic Grants

Form B

Existing building characteristics: give building age; or give only those aspects of building envelop, heating, ventilating & air conditioning plant & systems, lighting usage, etc. pertinent to the energy conservation measure described below

General description of energy conservation measure:

Estimated cost \$ _____
 BTU saved/year _____
 Type of fuel saved _____
 Cost/BTU _____ (1976-77 price)
 Cost avoided/year _____ (1976-77 price)
 Authenticated by _____
 signature _____

III.-B: MODEL APPLICATION FORM FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (S. 701)

Proposed Grant Application Form (S701) -- Technical Assistance

APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE ENERGY CONSERVATION -- TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE			Date Prepared	2. CODING
1. Federal Grantor Agency			3. CODING	
			4.	
			Applicant	
administrative unit			school district, department, division	
street address			street address	
city	state	zip code	city	county
			state	zip code

5. Demonstrated energy need. Reason: Relief is sought due to: (Explanation)
- a) high energy costs a) \$ / unit of fuel
- b) energy shortage b) document
reduced allocation
school closing due to energy shortage
- c) unusually harsh and persistent c) Degree days
adverse weather conditions (July 1, 1976-June 30, 1977)
Other conditions (explain):

6. Name and address of building(s) for which application is made:

7. Building(s) description: give building age; additions; roof and wall structure; heating, ventilating and air conditioning plants and distribution systems; lighting, usage for each building by name.

8. Projection justification: Factors contributing to need for Technical Assistance grant:

9. Approximate cost (attach calculation.) \$ _____

10. FEDERAL REQUEST
Federal Share (50%) \$ _____

11. Energy data

A. FUEL USED July 1, 1972 - June 30, 1973

Type	KWH, Tons, Gal., CCF	Factor	BTU x 10 ⁶	%	Cost	Cost/ BTU
oil	_____ gals	138 #2 oil 145 #4 oil 148 #5 oil 150 #6 oil			/gal	
gas	_____ CCF	1			/CCF	
coal	_____ tons	25,400 anthracite 21,000 western 21,600 bituminous			/ton	
elec other	_____ KWH	3.41			/KWH	
TOTAL				100%		

B. FUEL USED July 1, 1976 - June 30, 1977

Type	KWH, Tons, Gal., CCF	Factor	BTU x 10 ⁶	%	Cost	Cost/ BTU
oil	_____ gals	138 #2 oil 145 #4 oil 148 #5 oil 150 #6 oil			/gal	
gas	_____ CCF	1			/CCF	
coal	_____ tons	25,400 anthracite 21,000 western 21,600 bituminous			/ton	
elec other	_____ KWH	3.41			/KWH	
TOTAL				100%		

12. Sq. ft. of total building floor(s) _____
13. Degree days (July 1, 1976 - June 30, 1977) _____
14. BTU/sq. ft. (July 1, 1976 - June 30, 1977) _____ by grant buildings
15. BTU/sq. ft. (July 1, 1976 - June 30, 1977) _____ by grant buildings
16. BTU/sq. ft./degree day _____ for July 1, 1976 - June 30, 1977
17. Proposed method of financing local share _____

Sources(s) of funding	Amount
1. _____	\$ _____
2. _____	\$ _____
3. _____	\$ _____
4. _____	\$ _____
TOTAL	\$ _____

Pending matching funds: (explain) _____

18. Other factors contributing to need for Technical Assistance grant (optional):
- _____
- _____
- _____

19. Identify proposed source(s) of Technical Assistance. Attach qualifications information.
- _____
- _____
- _____

20. The applicant certifies that to the best of his/her knowledge and belief, the data in this application are true and correct, and that he/she will comply with the attached assurances if the grant is awarded.

Signature _____

name (print) _____

organization's name _____

title _____

phone number _____

Application form will also require:

Completed assurances, e.g. all legal requirements; sharing information with private schools

Instructions, including a completed sample form

III—C: MODEL CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF APPLICATIONS (S. 701)

PROPOSED CRITERIA FOR RANKING APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING UNDER EMERGENCY EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT (S. 701)

I. BASIC GRANTS

A. Eligibility requirements:

1. Type of agency "educational institution":
 - (a) Local educational agency.
 - (b) Institution of higher education.
2. Energy conservation need:
 - (a) High cost of energy.
 - (b) Energy shortage.
 - (c) Unusually harsh and persistent adverse weather conditions.
3. Local matching funds.
4. State approval as required.
5. Assurances are met.

B. Application criteria (100 points):

	<i>Points</i>
1. Potential energy savings.....	30
2. Recovery rate (number of years cost avoidance will amortize capital invested).....	10
3. Operational measures already taken (comparison of 1976-77 fuel consumption to baseline 1972-77 consumption).....	15
4. Type of fuel saved.....	5
5. Supply capabilities for fuel (Limited availability documented).....	20
6. Energy audit quality.....	5
7. Climatic concerns.....	5
8. Proposed evaluation procedures.....	5
9. Cost of fuel saved.....	5

II. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

A. Eligibility requirements:

1. Type of agency:
 - (a) Local education agencies.
 - (b) Institutions of higher education.
 - (c) State educational agencies.
 - (d) State energy offices.
 - (e) Other appropriate State agencies.
 - (f) Consortium of any of above.
2. Energy conservation need:
 - (a) High cost of energy.
 - (b) Energy shortage.
 - (c) Unusually harsh and persistent adverse weather conditions.
3. Local matching funds.
4. Assurances.

B. Application criteria (100 points):

	<i>Points</i>
1. Energy conservation need (BTU/sq. ft.).....	30
2. Operational conservation measures already undertaken (relate 1972-73 to 1976-77 consumption).....	15
3. Type of fuel.....	5
4. Fuel supply capabilities.....	20
5. Qualifications of technical assistance.....	5
6. Climatic concerns.....	5
7. Statement of technical assistance need and nature of need.....	15
8. Cost of fuel.....	5

Draft applications and criteria submitted by:
Ad Hoc Committee on Energy/Education Legislation, March 11,
1977.

Revised March 18, 1977.

V. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF S. 701

Section 1. This section gives the short title of the bill, "The Emergency Educational Assistance Act."

Section 2. This section gives a statement of findings concerning the impact of the energy crisis in schools and institutions of higher education.

Section 3. This section authorizes \$300 million for fiscal years 1978 through 1981 for the purpose of making matching grants to educational institutions for energy conservation measures including insulation, remodeling, and renovation.

Section 4. This section states how funds shall be allotted to the various States and also sets forth a reallocation program.

Section 5. This section specifies the uses of basic grants, being: insulation, remodeling, or renovation.

Section 6. This section states the method by which agencies or institutions may apply for basic grants and states further that applications shall be judged on the basis of their saving energy.

Section 7. This section authorizes \$50 million for demonstration projects, which are matching grants to States and educational institutions for innovative energy conservation projects. Applications shall be judged on the basis of their saving energy.

Section 8. This section authorizes \$150 million for Technical Assistance grants, which are matching grants to States, local educational agencies, and institutions of higher education for programs involving planning, studies, or the temporary employment of specialized personnel. Applications shall be judged on the basis of their saving energy and on the basis of the extent to which the projects reach all institutions in the area from which the application is made.

Section 9. This section states the extent to which the Federal Government will pay for work undertaken pursuant to an approved application, being: Basic grants, 50 percent Federal—50 percent applicant; Demonstration grants, 66⅔ percent Federal—33⅓ percent applicant; and Technical Assistance, 50 percent Federal—50 percent applicant. A waiver of the applicant's share, under extreme cases, is provided.

Section 10. This section states the cases in which the Commissioner may withhold funds for projects carried out pursuant to this act.

Section 11. This section provides for consultation, by the Commissioner, with educational officials, engineers, and any agency of the Federal Government in the promulgation of regulations and in administering this act.

Section 12. This section provides definitions for terms used in this act.

Section 13. This section provides for the severability of any provision or use thereof from the other parts of the act should such a provision or use be held invalid.

VI. CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL AS REPORTED

In compliance with Subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman) :

S. 701 makes no changes in existing law.

○